

Sep 21 12 05:01p

Case 3:10-cv-30171-MAP Document 36 Filed 09/21/12 Page 1 of 3

p.2

Michael A. McCray
40 Stockman Street
Springfield, MA 01104-2516
(413)-739-7455

September 21, 2012

Judge Michael A. Ponsor
United States District Court
300 State Street, Suite 120
Springfield, MA 01105-2919

Re: February 2012 Decision Complaint; Case No. 3:10-CV-30171-MAP

Dear Judge Ponsor,

I am very upset that the decision to dismiss my complaint was made in February 2012 but I was not notified of the decision until September 18, 2012 via a post it stamp. And since my case has been closed I hope this is not an ex-parte communication.

The defendant's were notified of the court's decision in a timely manner but I was not. I am aware that I am a lay person trying to make my way through a very complicated legal process but at the very least I should have been afforded the same right to due process that the defendants were granted.

I have made it perfectly clear that I do not know what I am doing and I do not know the correct legal terminology or the proper procedures but I have tried my best to present my case to the court and it has not been a pleasant experience through the clerk's office. My complaint was dismissed in 2010 because the clerk's office did not notify the court that I communicated with the clerk's office within the 120 day time frame so I provided evidence of the communication and your honor granted my motion for reconsideration and ordered the clerk to reopen my claim on March 9, 2011.

I sent additional information to the court pertaining to my civil complaint after February 2012 but I was never informed that my complaint was dismissed so I thought my case was still under review.

I believe the court made errors in their decision but I have lost seven months time to file an appeal or to file another civil complaint within the proper jurisdiction. I also feel the court should not have dismissed the entire case. The court could have upheld the section where I sought a cease and desist injunction because the USPS has already been court ordered to cease and desist their intimidation of health care providers in **APWU v. USPS OIG 08-CV-00458** but the defendant in my case has been acting on a local level to prevent my FECA rights therefore violating my right to due process.

The defendants are preventing me from establishing causal relationship by interfering with my physicians which is a gross violation of my right to due process and Grichenko v. USPS is exactly what I have been trying to say. I am not arguing the OWCP decision, I am arguing that

The clerk is ordered to re-open this case to allow the court to rule on this motion for reconsideration. The motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED on the ground that the court's original ruling was correct. Plaintiff may now, if he wishes, proceed with a timely appeal. So ordered.
Michael A. Ponsor 11/13/12